



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

such good stead. In the second Conference he threw the full weight of his influence in favor of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, which failed because of the opposition of Germany, though it carried in its support no less than thirty-five of the forty-four delegations. After the calling of the second Hague Conference he was sent by the Russian government to visit all the capitals of Europe, with a view to promoting the best possible results from the Conference, and it was due in no small measure to this tour that the Conference was so great a success. During this visit he expressed the opinion that, though the subject of armaments had not been placed on the program of the second Conference by his government, it nevertheless was likely to be taken up, as it had been left over from the Conference of 1899 as unfinished business. He assured the various governments that the Czar had not in the least changed the views on the subject which he held in 1898, when he issued his call for the first Conference.

Mr. de Martens was very much opposed to the war between Russia and Japan, and did what was in his power to try to prevent it, by means of the good offices of other governments or otherwise. But for the haste of Japan in breaking off diplomatic relations and rushing into war, it is probable that he would have induced his government to appeal to the good offices of foreign powers to settle the questions at issue and prevent hostilities. He was afterwards sent as one of the Russian Commissioners to the Portsmouth Conference, through which the war was brought to a close. Here he did much, through his wide experience and wisdom, to make a pacific outcome possible.

It is not generally known that it was on the suggestion of Mr. de Martens that Mr. Carnegie made the great gift of a million and a half of dollars for the Palace of Peace at The Hague. But such is the fact. In an interesting article on Professor de Martens in the *Friedenswarte*, Mr. A. H. Fried publishes the following letter which he had received from Mr. de Martens in January, 1905, giving the facts as to the origin of the Peace Palace:

"As far as concerns the Arbitration Palace, its history is very simple. In December, 1899,—that is, just after the Hague Peace Conference,—I was asked by Carnegie, through W. Stead, to answer the following question: 'How could Carnegie best use his colossal fortune of forty million pounds for the good of humanity?' I wrote a letter in which I set before Carnegie that, in my judgment, he could best serve humanity by setting apart a fund for the building of a Palace for the Hague Court. The thought found fruitful soil. But with the help of my friends Andrew White, Holls and Anderson, I had to work three years for the realization of the thought. That is the history of the Palace."

Professor de Martens never came much, if at all, into touch with the peace societies and peace congresses, or

even with the Interparliamentary Union. Russia had no peace societies, and, being a non-constitutional monarchy, had no representatives in the Interparliamentary Union. But, in spite of the limitations thus imposed, he managed through his profession, through his wide diplomatic and arbitration service, and through the Hague Conferences, to make a contribution of the first order toward the establishment of peace throughout the world on a permanent judicial basis.

The Bolivia-Peru Boundary Dispute.

The situation which has arisen in South America over the arbitration by the Argentine government of the Bolivia-Peru Boundary dispute is a most unfortunate one, whether it leads to actual hostilities or not.

So far as we recall, no such serious situation has ever before arisen in connection with any one of the more than two hundred and fifty arbitrations of the past century. In the case of the Northeastern Boundary controversy between this country and Great Britain, the award of the arbitrator, the King of The Netherlands, was not acceptable to the United States government, and was waived by both governments because the arbitrator had gone beyond competence and laid down another line than the one called for by the treaty. But this course gave rise to no bitterness, and the dispute was afterwards disposed of, with good feeling on both sides, under the Webster-Ashburton agreement. There was a great deal of criticism of the award of the Hague Court in the case of the Venezuela Preferential Payment controversy, when the three powers which had bombarded Venezuelan ports were allowed payment of damages before the other powers could receive anything. But no diplomatic complications arose. All the ten powers interested loyally accepted the judgment.

In the case before us the Bolivians have behaved in a very surprising way. The two governments had entered into a formal solemn agreement to submit the dispute to the arbitration of President Alcorta of Argentina and to accept his decision as final. The Congresses of both countries sanctioned the agreement. The question at issue was that of the famous Acre district, covering some two thousand square miles and rich in minerals, which has been for many years in dispute. The case had been complicated by the cession of a part of the district by Bolivia to Brazil, for ten million dollars, in face of the warning issued by Peru at the time that the territory was then in controversy and subject to arbitration. Brazil is thus inevitably involved in the trouble.

When the award of President Alcorta was announced in the Bolivian capital as being more favorable to Peru, though a part of the district was given to Bolivia, the Bolivian population everywhere began at once to express

its disapproval. The capital, La Paz, at once passed under the control of a mob. The Argentine legation was furiously attacked and the government found it necessary to order out the troops to protect the legations of both Argentina and Peru. The Bolivian Minister at Buenos Ayres refused to appear when he and the Peruvian Minister were invited by the Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs to come to the Foreign Office to receive official notice of the arbitral award. The decision of President Alcorta has been so abusively criticised and the demonstrations against Argentine officials in Bolivia have been so violent that the Argentine government has dismissed the Bolivian Minister, called home its representative at La Paz, and all diplomatic relations between the two countries have been severed. It looked for some days as if hostilities could not be avoided and that in case of war Brazil might be drawn into the conflict.

President Mendes of Bolivia has asserted that his reason for refusing to accept the arbitral award is that part of the territory which Peru never occupied is recognized by the decision as belonging to that country, and that the award cedes to Peru territory that is outside of the limits of arbitration. Even if this be a correct view, it does not in any way justify the shameful conduct of the Bolivians toward the Peruvians and Argentines resident in the country, many of whom promptly left the country in order to escape violence. If such an injustice had been committed by the arbitrator, time and patient diplomacy might have found a remedy. The President of Bolivia, forgetting the solemn pledge given in advance to abide by the result of the arbitration, has certainly not felt a very keen sense of honor before the public opinion of the world. His view of national honor is a very antique one.

It is scarcely conceivable that war will actually result from the situation. Argentina is too great and advanced and sensible a nation to allowed herself rashly to plunge into hostilities with her weak neighbor to the north in order to vindicate her honor against the supposed injury inflicted by the Bolivian government and people. It is Bolivia whose honor has suffered, rather than Argentina.

Then, too, there are many other considerations that make for the preservation of peace. These countries are now both parties to the Hague Conventions. They have also another arbitration agreement between themselves. The other governments, including especially our own, are exerting themselves in every proper way to avert hostilities. The American Ministers at Buenos Ayres and La Paz have been placed in charge of the affairs of Bolivia and Argentina respectively during the rupture of diplomatic relations. Under the pressure which is being brought to bear from outside in favor of a pacific adjustment, some amicable way out is sure to be found. The

latest information received at the State Department at Washington makes this certain. The governments of Bolivia and Peru are reported to have mutually agreed to open negotiations directly with each other without the intervention of any other power, in the hope of arranging a modification of the Argentine award which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

There is one very important lesson taught by this unfortunate affair. This lesson is that such controversies as this should no longer be referred to any single government or temporary board of arbitration. The nations of the world now have a general Arbitration Court at The Hague of such a character as to receive and deserve the confidence of all the powers which are parties to it. All important disputes between nations should now, as a matter of course, be referred to this Court. If this course had been followed by Bolivia and Peru, it is almost certain that no such squabble as that which has arisen would have occurred. The difficulty would have been much more thoroughly and impartially investigated than was actually the case. One of the charges brought by the Bolivian government is that the President of the Argentine Republic did not send a commission to make an investigation on the spot. An award given by the Hague Court would thus have been of a character to command the immediate acceptance of both governments. Temporary arbitration courts and individual arbitrators have served their day and served it well, but their time has passed. The International Arbitration Court at The Hague is now the body to which all important international controversies ought as a matter of course to be referred.

The Stockholm Peace Congress and the Progress of the Peace Movement.

The approaching eighteenth International Peace Congress, which meets at Stockholm August 29 to September 5, calls to mind the enormous progress which the movement for world peace has made in twenty years. In 1889, at the time of the first Paris Exposition, a few friends of peace from the United States, Great Britain, France and two or three other European countries, met at the French capital and held the first of the modern series of International Peace Congresses. Their meetings passed quite unnoticed by the press and the public, or were ridiculed as the sentimental performances of visionaries. Last year in London, after nineteen years of congresses held in the great capitals and chief cities of the world, and growing in numbers and power from year to year, the pacifists met for their seventeenth international gathering. They were welcomed by the King and Queen of England and by the British Cabinet with a cordiality and generosity of hospitality rarely extended in these days to any body of philanthropic workers. King Edward and the Queen received in Buckingham Palace a large deputation from the Congress, and the